

**REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated July 22, 2004.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-5 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 6-9 in order to overcome the rejection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Dallman. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dallman. Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-5 have been canceled and replaced with new claims 6-9. New claim 6 is rewritten from claim 5 and new claims 7-9 are dependent to new claim 6.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the new claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for examination, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



SIGNATURE

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

October 21, 2004